Context-invariant quasi hidden variable (qHV) modelling of all joint von Neumann measurements for an arbitrary Hilbert space

Elena R. Loubenets[1]

Moscow State Institute of Electronics and Mathematics,

Moscow 109028, Russia

We prove the existence for each Hilbert space of the two new quasi hidden variable (qHV) models, *statistically noncontextual and context-invariant,* reproducing all the von Neumann joint probabilities via nonnegative values of real-valued measures and all the quantum product expectations – via the qHV (classical-like) average of the product of the corresponding random variables. In a context-invariant model, a quantum observable X can be represented by a variety of random variables satisfying the functional condition required in quantum foundations but each of these random variables equivalently models X under all joint von Neumann measurements, regardless of their contexts. The proved existence of this model *negates the general opinion* that, in terms of random variables, the Hilbert space description of all the joint von Neumann measurements for $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$ can be reproduced only contextually. The existence of a statistically noncontextual qHV model, in particular, implies that *every N-partite quantum state admits a local quasi hidden variable (LqHV) model* introduced in [Loubenets, *J. Math. Phys.* **53**, 022201 (2012)]. The new results of the present paper point also to the generality of the quasi-classical probability model proposed in [Loubenets, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **45**, 185306 (2012)].

arXiv:1402.4023v3 [quant-ph] 14 Mar 2015

CONTENTS

I. Introduction 2

II. Preliminaries 5

III. Von Neumann measurements 9

IV. Symmetrized products of spectral measures 11

A. The extension theorem 12

V. Quasi hidden variable (qHV) modelling 15

A. A statistically noncontextual qHV model 16

B. A context-invariant qHV model 21

VI. Conclusions 24

A. proof of lemma 1 26

B. a generalization of the Kolmogorov extension theorem 27

C. proof of lemma 2 30

D. proof of theorem 3 and corollary 3 31

References 33

I. INTRODUCTION

The relation between the quantum probability model and the classical probability model has been a point of intensive discussions ever since the seminal publications of von Neumann[1], Kolmogorov[2], and Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen (EPR)[3]. In the frame of the quantum formalism**,** the interpretation of von Neumann measurements in classical probability terms, that is, via random variables and probability measures on a measurable space[4] $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$, is generally referred to as *a hidden variable (HV) model*, but a setting of a HV model depends essentially on its aim. Moreover, in the literature, the HV models are usually divided into noncontextual and contextual.

In a noncontextual model, each quantum observable X is represented on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ *by only one* random variable f_X with values in the spectrum sp$X$ of this observable X.

In a contextual model, not only there are quantum observables X_γ, $\gamma \in \Upsilon$, each modelled by a variety of random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$, but also – which of these random variables represents an observable X_γ under a joint von Neumann measurement depends specifically on a *context* of this measurement, i. e. on other compatible quantum observables measured jointly with X_γ.

In foundations of quantum theory, where a HV model aims to reproduce in classical probability terms the statistical properties of *all* quantum observables on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, the intention to mimic all the properties of quantum averages and quantum correlations was realized via some additional functional assumptions[1,5,6] on a correspondence between random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ and quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$. Under these functional assumptions, for $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$, there does not exist a noncontextual HV model reproducing the Hilbert space description of all the joint von Neumann measurements (for details see section II).

In quantum information theory, a HV model aims to reproduce *only* the probabilistic description of a quantum correlation scenario upon a state ρ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_N$, so that a noncontextual HV model is introduced[7] directly via the noncontextual representation of all scenario joint probabilities in classical probability terms. This HV representation mimics by itself all the needed properties of quantum averages and quantum correlations, so that, for a quantum correlation scenario, a setting of a noncontextual HV model is not supplied[7] by any additional assumptions on a correspondence between random variables and modelled quantum observables. As a result, for each dimension of a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_N$, there exist[7] quantum correlation scenarios admitting noncontextual HV models. Ever since the arguments of Bell[8,9], a noncontextual HV model for a quantum correlation scenario is generally referred to as local and a LHV model, for short (see section II for details).

From the point of view of quantum information applications, the existence of LHV models for some quantum correlation scenarios questioned whether there exists a probability model which could reproduce the probabilistic description of every quantum correlation scenario via random variables, each depending only on a setting of the corresponding measurement at the corresponding site, i. e. via "local" random variables.

As we proved in Ref. 10, the answer to this question is positive – the probabilistic

description of *every* quantum correlation scenario does admit a new local probability model – *a local quasi hidden variable (LqHV) model,* where locality and the measure theory structure $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega, \nu)$ inherent to a LHV model are preserved but positivity of a simulation measure ν is dropped.

In a (deterministic[11]) LqHV model, specified by a measure space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega, \nu)$, all the joint probabilities and all the quantum product averages of a correlation scenario are reproduced via nonnegative values of a normalized real-valued measure ν and "local" random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$.

Moreover, we showed in Ref. 12 that the probabilistic description of every *nonsignaling*[7] correlation scenario, not necessarily quantum, also admits a LqHV model.

Based on our results in Refs. 10, 12, we also introduced[12] the notion of *a quasi-classical probability model* - a new general probability model, which is specified in terms of a measure space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega, \nu)$ with a normalized real-valued measure ν and where a joint measurement with outcomes $(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \Lambda_{\theta_1} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{\theta_n}$ and marginal measurements, represented by random variables $f_{\theta_i} : \Omega \to \Lambda_{\theta_i}$, $i = 1, ..., n$, is possible if and only if

$$\nu(f^{-1}_{\theta_1,...,\theta_n}(B)) \geq 0, \quad \forall B \subseteq \Lambda_{\theta_1} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{\theta_n}, \tag{1}$$

where $f_{\theta_1,...,\theta_n} = (f_{\theta_1}, ..., f_{\theta_n})$ and $f^{-1}_{\theta_1,...,\theta_n}(B) = \{\omega \in \Omega \mid (f_{\theta_1}(\omega), ..., f_{\theta_n}(\omega)) \in B\}$. This new probability model reduces to the Kolmogorov probability model[2,13] iff a real-valued measure ν is positive.

If a quasi-classical probability model is applied for the description of quantum measurements, then, according to our terminology in Refs. 10, 12, we refer to it as a qHV model.

In the present paper, we analyze further possibilities of the qHV approach[10,12] and prove that, for each Hilbert space, the Hilbert space description of all the joint von Neumann measurements can be reproduced via either of the two new qHV models, which we call as *statistically noncontextual and context-invariant.*

*In a statistically noncontextual model***,** each quantum observable X is represented on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ *by only one* random variable f_X with values in the spectrum sp$X$ of this observable X and the Kochen-Specker functional conditions[5] are satisfied in average (for details see section II below).

*In a context-invariant model***,** a quantum observable X can be modelled on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ by a variety of random variables satisfying the functional condition generally required in

quantum foundations (see relation (5) below) but, in contrast to a contextual model, each of these random variables equivalently models X under all joint von Neumann measurements, independently of their contexts, in other words, the representation of X by each of these random variables is invariant with respect to a context of a joint von Neumann measurement.

For $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 4$, the HV versions of these models cannot exist (see section II).

The proved existence of *a context-invariant qHV model negates the general opinion* that, via random variables satisfying the functional condition required in quantum foundations, the Hilbert space description of all the joint von Neumann measurements for $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$ can be reproduced only contextually.

The paper is organized as follows.

In section II, we shortly review the settings of the HV models available in the literature.

In section III, we recall the von Neumann formalism for the description of ideal (projective) quantum measurements and the notion of the spectral measure of a quantum observable.

In section IV, based on our generalization (appendix B) of some items of the Kolmogorov extension theorem[2] to the case of consistent operator-valued measures, we prove (theorem 1) that all symmetrized products of spectral measures admit the representation via the uniquely defined self-adjoint operator-valued measure and the specific random variables on the specially constructed measurable space $(\Lambda, \mathcal{F}_\Lambda)$.

In section V, we apply the new mathematical results of section IV to qHV modelling (theorems 2, 3, corollaries 2, 3, propositions 2, 3) of the Hilbert space description of the all joint von Neumann measurements for an arbitrary Hilbert space.

In section VI, we discuss the main new results of the present paper.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we shortly review settings of the HV models available in quantum foundations and quantum information.

In foundations of quantum theory, the first *"no-go" theorem* on non-existence of *a non-contextual HV model* reproducing the statistical properties of all quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$ was introduced[1] by von Neumann in 1932.

However, analyzing[8,9] this problem in 1964 - 1966, Bell explicitly constructed[9] the non-

contextual HV model for all quantum observables of the qubit ($\dim \mathcal{H} = 2$) and argued[9] that, though the proof of the von Neumann "no-go" theorem is mathematically correct, the setting of this theorem contains the linearity assumption which is inconsistent with the quantum formalism and is not, in particular, fulfilled in the specific HV model presented by him in Ref. 9.

In 1967, Kochen and Specker introduced[5] a new setting for a noncontextual HV model where a mapping $X \stackrel{\Phi}{\mapsto} f_X$, $f_X(\Omega) = \mathrm{sp}X$, from the set of all quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$ into the set of all random variables on a measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ was supplied by the physically motivated functional condition

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\varphi \circ X) &= \varphi \circ \Phi(X) \\ &\equiv \varphi \circ f_X \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

for all quantum observables X on $\mathcal{H}$ and all Borel real-valued functions $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$. Since quantum observables $X_1, ..., X_n$ mutually commute iff[14] there exist a quantum observable Z and Borel functions $\varphi_i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that all $X_i = \varphi_i(Z)$, $i = 1, ..., n$, condition (2) does imply linearity of a mapping Φ:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(X_1 + \cdots + X_n) &= \Phi(X_1) + \cdots + \Phi(X_n) \\ &\equiv f_{X_1} + \cdots + f_{X_n} \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

and also its multiplicativity

$$(\Phi(X_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot X_n))(\omega) = f_{X_1}(\omega) \cdot \ldots \cdot f_{X_n}(\omega), \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega, \tag{4}$$

but – *only for mutually commuting quantum observables.*

Kochen and Specker proved[5] that, for a Hilbert space of a dimension $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$, a noncontextual HV model supplied by the functional conditions (3), (4) cannot exist.

For the case where, in a setting of a HV model, a quantum observable X on $\mathcal{H}$ can be represented by a variety $\{f_X^{(\theta)}, \theta \in \Theta_X\}$ of random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$, it was proved (proposition 1.4.2 in Ref. 6) that, for each Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, there exist a measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ and a mapping Ψ from a set of random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ onto the set of all quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$ such that (i) the HV representation $\langle X \rangle_\rho = \langle f_X^{(\theta)} \rangle_{HV}$ of the quantum average of each observable X in a state ρ and (ii) the functional condition

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(\varphi \circ f_X^{(\theta)}) &= \varphi \circ \Psi(f_X^{(\theta)}) \\ &= \varphi \circ X, \quad \forall X, \quad \forall \varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

similar by its sense to condition (2) are fulfilled for each of random variables $\{f_X^{(\theta)}, \theta \in \Theta_X\}$ representing a quantum observable X. If $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$, then this mapping Ψ cannot be injective due to the Kochen-Specker result[5] and, therefore, the HV model specified by the above setting cannot be *noncontextual*. Furthermore, for $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$, this HV model implies[16] the *contextual* description of a joint von Neumann measurement of mutually commuting quantum observables $X_1, ..., X_n$ – in the sense that, under a joint von Neumann measurement, an observable X_i is, in general, represented by a random variable specific for a *context* of this joint measurement. Therefore, for a Hilbert space of a dimension $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$, the HV model specified by proposition 1.4.2 in Ref. 6 is *contextual.*

Moreover, it is generally argued that this *contextuality* is always the case whenever a mapping Ψ from a set of random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ onto the set of all quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$ is non-injective. As we prove in section V, this opinion is misleading.

In quantum information, for some quantum correlation scenarios, their noncontextual HV description is possible, while for others – is impossible. Since contextual HV modelling is possible for all N-partite joint measurements on a N-partite quantum state, Bell presumed[8,9] that, for an N-partite case, the only physical reason for non-existence of a noncontextual HV model is *quantum nonlocality*[17] – in contrast to *locality* of parties' measurements argued by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen (EPR) in Ref. 3.

Ever since this Bell's conjecture, a HV model for a quantum correlation scenario is called local and is referred to as a *LHV* model if, in this model, each random variable modelling a party's measurement depends only on a setting of this measurement at the corresponding site.

If all possible N-partite joint von Neumann measurements an N-partite quantum state admit[18] a single LHV model, then this N-partite state is also referred to as *local.*

An arbitrary N-partite quantum correlation scenario does not need to admit a LHV model. Also, an arbitrary N-partite quantum state does not need to be local. However, not only every separable quantum state is local – Werner[18] presented the example of a nonseparable (entangled) quantum state on $\mathbb{C}^d \otimes \mathbb{C}^d$, $d \geq 2$, which is local under all bipartite joint von Neumann measurements on this state. Moreover, there also exist[7,19–22] nonseparable N-partite quantum states, that behave themselves as *local* under every N-partite quantum correlation scenario with some specific number $S_n \leq S_n^{(0)}$ of quantum measurements at each n-th site.

Furthermore, as we proved in Refs. 10, 12 *every N-partite quantum correlation scenario admits a local quasi hidden variable (LqHV) model*, described in Introduction.

In view of the above analysis of different settings of HV models available now in the literature and the new quasi hidden variable (qHV) approach, developed in Refs. 10, 12 and outlined in Introduction, we put the following questions important for both – quantum foundations and quantum information.

1. Does every N-partite quantum state admit a LqHV model?

2. Can the Hilbert space description of all the von Neumann joint probabilities and product averages be reproduced via a qHV model where to each quantum observables there corresponds only one random variable and a mapping $X \stackrel{\Phi}{\mapsto} f_X$, $f_X(\Omega) = \mathrm{sp}X$, satisfies *in average* both – the von Neumann[1] linearity assumption and the Kochen-Specker assumptions (2), (4), in other words, satisfies for each quantum state ρ the average relations

$$\langle \varphi \circ X \rangle_\rho = \langle \varphi \circ f_X \rangle_{qHV}, \tag{6}$$

$$\langle X_1 + \cdots + X_n \rangle_\rho = \langle f_{X_1} + \cdots + f_{X_n} \rangle_{qHV}\,, \tag{7}$$

$$\langle X_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot X_n \rangle_\rho = \langle f_{X_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot f_{X_n} \rangle_{qHV}\,, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{8}$$

where relation (6) holds for all quantum observables X and all bounded Borel functions $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$; relation (7) – for all bounded quantum observables $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ on $\mathcal{H}$ and relation (8) is satisfied only for mutually commuting bounded quantum observables $X_1, \ldots, X_n$?

3. Does there exist a qHV model correctly reproducing all the von Neumann joint probabilities and product expectations and where (i) a quantum observable X can be represented by a variety $\{f_X^{(\theta)}, \theta \in \Theta_X\}$ of random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ satisfying the functional condition (5) required in quantum foundations, but each of these random variables *equivalently* represents a quantum observable X under all joint von Neumann measurements, *independently* of their measurement contexts; (ii) the average relations (6) - (8) hold with arbitrary representatives $f_{X_1}^{(\theta_1)}, \ldots, f_{X_n}^{(\theta_n)}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ of quantum observables $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ on $\mathcal{H}$?

In what follows, we answer *positively* to all of these questions and refer to the qHV model specified in questions 2, 3 as statistically noncontextual and context-invariant, respectively (for terminology, see also Introduction).

Note that, for $\dim\mathcal{H} \geq 4$**,** a statistically noncontextual HV model and a context-invariant HV model for all the joint von Neumann measurements cannot exist – since, otherwise, in

view of isometric isomorphism of complex separable Hilbert spaces of the same dimension, this would imply the existence of a LHV model for each two-qubit state, but, as it is well known, this is not[8] the case.

III. VON NEUMANN MEASUREMENTS

In the frame of the von Neumann formalism[1], states and observables of a quantum system are described, correspondingly, by density operators ρ and self-adjoint linear operators X on a complex separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, possibly infinite dimensional.

Let $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}^{(s)}$ be the real vector space of all self-adjoint bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. Equipped with the operator norm, this vector space is Banach. Denote by $\mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}} \supset \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}^{(s)}$ the set of all quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$, bounded and unbounded, and by $\mathrm{sp}X \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ the spectrum of a quantum observable X.

The probability that, under an ideal (errorless) measurement of a quantum observable $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$ in a state ρ, an observed value belongs to a Borel subset B of $\mathbb{R}$ is given[1,23,24] by the expression

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho \mathrm{P}_X(B)], \quad B \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}, \tag{9}$$

where $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$ is the Borel σ-algebra[25] on $\mathbb{R}$ and P_X is the spectral measure of an observable $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$, that is, the normalized projection-valued measure P_X on $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$, uniquely corresponding to an observable X due to the spectral theorem[1,23]

$$X = \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}} x \mathrm{P}_X(\mathrm{d}x). \tag{10}$$

The values $\mathrm{P}_X(B)$, $B \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$, $\mathrm{P}_X(\mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}}$, of this measure are projections on $\mathcal{H}$, satisfying the relations

$$\begin{gathered} \mathrm{P}_X(B_1)\mathrm{P}_X(B_2) = \mathrm{P}_X(B_2)\mathrm{P}_X(B_1) = \mathrm{P}_X(B_1 \cap B_2), \quad B_1, B_2 \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}, \\ \mathrm{P}_X(B) = 0, \quad B \notin \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathrm{sp}X. \end{gathered} \tag{11}$$

For each $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$, its spectrum $\mathrm{sp}X \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}}$. Due to the second relation in (11), we further consider the spectral measure P_X, $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$, only on the trace σ-algebra

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X} := \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathrm{sp}X. \tag{12}$$

The measure P_X is σ-additive in the strong operator topology[24,26] in $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}_{\mathcal{H}}$, that is:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\left\|\mathrm{P}_X(\cup_{i=1}^{\infty}B_i)\psi-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\mathrm{P}_X(B_i)\psi\right\|_{\mathcal{H}}=0 \tag{13}$$

for all $\psi\in\mathcal{H}$ and all countable collections $\{B_i\}$ of mutually disjoint sets in $\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X}$.

Remark 1 *In this article, we follow the terminology of Ref. 27. Namely, let $\mathfrak{B}$ be a Banach space and $\mathcal{F}_\Lambda$ be an algebra of subsets of a set Λ. We refer to an additive set function $\mathfrak{m}:\mathcal{F}_\Lambda\to\mathfrak{B}$ as a $\mathfrak{B}$-valued (finitely additive) measure on $\mathcal{F}_\Lambda$. If a measure $\mathfrak{m}$ on $\mathcal{F}_\Lambda$ is σ-additive in some topology in $\mathfrak{B}$, then we specify this in addition.*

An ideal measurement (9) of a quantum observable X in a state ρ is generally referred to as *the von Neumann measurement.*

The joint von Neumann measurement of several quantum observables $X_1,...,X_n\in\mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is possible[1,24] if and only if all values of their spectral measures mutually commute:

$$[\mathrm{P}_{X_{i_1}}(B_{i_1}),\mathrm{P}_{X_{i_2}}(B_{i_2})]=0,\quad B_i\in\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_i},\quad i=1,...,n. \tag{14}$$

and is described in this case by the projection-valued product measure[1,24]

$$\mathrm{P}_{X_1,...,X_n}(B):=\int\limits_{(x_1,...,x_n)\in B}\mathrm{P}_{X_1}(\mathrm{d}x_1)\cdot...\cdot\mathrm{P}_{X_n}(\mathrm{d}x_n),\quad B\in\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1\times\cdots\times\mathrm{sp}X_n}, \tag{15}$$

which is normalized $\mathrm{P}_{X_1,...,X_n}(\mathrm{sp}X_1\times\cdots\times\mathrm{sp}X_n)=\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}}$ and defined on the σ-algebra

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1\times\cdots\times\mathrm{sp}X_n}&:=\mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^n}\cap(\mathrm{sp}X_1\times\cdots\times\mathrm{sp}X_n)\\&=\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1}\otimes\cdots\otimes\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_n}\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

of Borel subsets of $\mathrm{sp}X_1\times\cdots\times\mathrm{sp}X_n$.

For bounded quantum observables $X_1,...,X_n\in\mathcal{L}^{(s)}_{\mathcal{H}}$, condition (14) is equivalent to mutual commutativity $[X_{i_1},X_{i_2}]=0$, $i=1,...,n.$ of these observables. Therefore, for short, we further refer to arbitrary quantum observables $X_1,...,X_n$, bounded or unbounded, as mutually commuting if their spectral measures satisfy condition (14). The measure $\mathrm{P}_{X_1,...,X_n}$ is also referred[26] to as the *joint spectral measure* of mutually commuting quantum observables $X_1,...,X_n$.

The expression

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho\mathrm{P}_{X_1,...,X_n}(B_1\times\ldots\times B_n)]=\mathrm{tr}[\rho(\mathrm{P}_{X_1}(B_1)\cdot...\cdot\mathrm{P}_{X_n}(B_n))] \tag{17}$$

defines the probability that the observed values of mutually commuting quantum observables $X_1,...,X_n$ are in sets $B_1\in\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1},...,B_n\in\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_n}$, respectively.

IV. SYMMETRIZED PRODUCTS OF SPECTRAL MEASURES

In this section, for our further consideration in section V, we introduce a new operator-valued measure induced by the symmetrized product of spectral measures of quantum observables and prove the extension theorem for the consistent family of these operator-valued measures.

For an n-tuple $(X_1, ..., X_n)$ of arbitrary mutually non-equal quantum observables $X_1, ..., X_n \in \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$, let $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1\times\cdots\times\mathrm{sp}X_n}$ be the *product algebra* on $\mathrm{sp}X_1 \times \cdots \times \mathrm{sp}X_n \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, that is, the algebra generated by all rectangles $B_1 \times \cdots \times B_n \subseteq \mathrm{sp}X_1 \times \cdots \times \mathrm{sp}X_n$ with measurable sides $B_i \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_i}$.

Let

$$\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)} : \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1\times\cdots\times\mathrm{sp}X_n} \to \mathcal{L}^{(s)}_{\mathcal{H}}, \qquad \mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}(\mathrm{sp}X_1 \times \cdots \times \mathrm{sp}X_n) = \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}}, \tag{18}$$

be the normalized (finitely additive) product measure on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1\times\cdots\times\mathrm{sp}X_n}$, defined uniquely via its representation

$$\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}(B_1 \times \cdots \times B_n) = \frac{1}{n!}\left\{\mathrm{P}_{X_1}(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mathrm{P}_{X_n}(B_n)\right\}_{\mathrm{sym}} \tag{19}$$

on all rectangles $B_1 \times \cdots \times B_n$ with $B_i \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_i}$. The values of the measure $\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}$ are self-adjoint bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$. Here, notation $\{Z_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot Z_n\}_{\mathrm{sym}}$ means the sum constituting the symmetrization of the operator product $Z_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot Z_n$, where $Z_i \in \mathcal{L}^{(s)}_{\mathcal{H}}$, with respect to all permutations of its factors.

For a collection $\{X_1, ..., X_n\}$ of mutually commuting quantum observables, the measure $\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}$ is projection-valued and constitutes the restriction to the product algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1\times\cdots\times\mathrm{sp}X_n}$ of the joint spectral measure $\mathrm{P}_{X_1,...,X_n}$ defined by relation (15) on the σ-algebra $\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1\times\cdots\times\mathrm{sp}X_n}$.

If each observable X_i in a collection $\{X_1, ..., X_n\}$ is bounded, i.e. $X_i \in \mathcal{L}^{(s)}_{\mathcal{H}}$, and, moreover, has only a discrete spectrum $\mathrm{sp}X_i = \{x_i^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R},\ k = 1, ..., K_{X_i} < \infty\}$, where each $x_i^{(k)}$ is an eigenvalue of X_i, then the product algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1\times\cdots\times\mathrm{sp}X_n}$ is finite and coincides with the σ-algebra $\mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1\times\cdots\times\mathrm{sp}X_n}$ while the product measure $\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}$ takes the form

$$\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}(F) := \frac{1}{n!}\sum_{(x_1,...,x_n)\in F}\left\{\mathrm{P}_{X_1}(\{x_1\}) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mathrm{P}_{X_n}(\{x_n\})\right\}_{\mathrm{sym}} \tag{20}$$

for all $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1\times\cdots\times\mathrm{sp}X_n}$.

Consider the family

$$\{\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)} \mid \{X_1,...,X_n\} \subset \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}},\ n \in \mathbb{N}\} \tag{21}$$

of all normalized $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}_{\mathcal{H}}$-valued measures (18), each specified by a tuple $(X_1,...,X_n)$ of mutually non-equal quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$. These measures satisfy the following consistency relations proved in appendix A.

Lemma 1 *For every collection* $\{X_1,...,X_n\} \subset \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, *of quantum observables on* $\mathcal{H}$, *the relation*

$$\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}(B_1 \times \cdots \times B_n) = \mathcal{P}_{(X_{i_1},...,X_{i_n})}(B_{i_1} \times \cdots \times B_{i_n}), \tag{22}$$
$$B_1 \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1},...,B_n \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_n},$$

holds for all permutations $\binom{1,...,n}{i_1,...,i_n}$ *of indexes and the relation*

$$\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}\left(\{\ (x_1,...,x_n) \in \mathrm{sp}X_1 \times \cdots \times \mathrm{sp}X_n \mid (x_{i_1},...,x_{i_k}) \in F\}\right) \tag{23}$$
$$= \mathcal{P}_{(X_{i_1},...,X_{i_k})}(F), \qquad F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sp}X_{i_1}\times\cdots\times\mathrm{sp}X_{i_k}},$$

is fulfilled for each $\{X_{i_1},...,X_{i_k}\} \subseteq \{X_1,...,X_n\}$.

Note that, for the operator-valued measures $\{\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}\}$, relations (22), (23) are quite similar by their form to the Kolmogorov consistency conditions[2,13] for a family

$$\{\mu_{(t_1,...,t_n)} : \mathcal{B}_{\mathbb{R}^n} \to [0,1]\ \mid \{t_1,...,t_n\} \subset T,\ \ n \in \mathbb{N}\} \tag{24}$$

of probability measures $\mu_{(t_1,...,t_n)}$, each specified by a tuple $(t_1,...,t_n)$ of mutually non-equal elements in an index set T.

In view of this similarity and for our further consideration, in appendix B, we generalize to the case of consistent operator-valued measures some items of the Kolmogorov extension theorem[2,13] for consistent probability measures (24).

A. The extension theorem

Denote by $\Lambda := \prod_{X \in\, \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}} \mathrm{sp}X$ the Cartesian product of the spectrums of all the quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$. By its definition[25], Λ is the set of all real-valued functions

$$\lambda : \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}} \to \cup_{X \in \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}} \mathrm{sp}X \tag{25}$$

with values $\lambda(X) \equiv \lambda_X \in \mathrm{sp}X$.

Let the random variable $\pi_{(X_1,...,X_n)} : \Lambda \to \mathrm{sp}X_1 \times \cdots \times \mathrm{sp}X_n$ be the canonical projection on Λ :

$$\pi_{(X_1,...,X_n)}(\lambda) := (\pi_{X_1}(\lambda), ..., \pi_{X_n}(\lambda)), \tag{26}$$
$$\pi_X(\lambda) := \lambda_X \in \mathrm{sp}X.$$

The set

$$\mathcal{A}_\Lambda = \left\{ \pi^{-1}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}(F) \subseteq \Lambda \mid F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1 \times \cdots \times \mathrm{sp}X_n}, \quad \{X_1, ..., X_n\} \subset \mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \tag{27}$$

of all cylindrical subsets of Λ of the form

$$\pi^{-1}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}(F) := \{\lambda \in \Lambda \mid (\pi_{X_1}(\lambda), ..., \pi_{X_n}(\lambda)) \in F\}, \tag{28}$$

constitutes an algebra on Λ (proposition III.11.18 in Ref. 25).

Due to lemma 3 proved in appendix B and generalizing some items of the Kolmogorov extension theorem to the case of consistent operator-valued measures, we have the following statement.

Theorem 1 (The extension theorem) *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex separable Hilbert space. For family (21) of finitely additive $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}_\mathcal{H}$-valued measures $\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)} : \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1 \times \cdots \times \mathrm{sp}X_n} \to \mathcal{L}^{(s)}_\mathcal{H}$, there exists a unique normalized finitely additive $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}_\mathcal{H}$-valued measure*

$$\mathbb{M} : \mathcal{A}_\Lambda \to \mathcal{L}^{(s)}_\mathcal{H}, \qquad \mathbb{M}(\Lambda) = \mathbb{I}_\mathcal{H}, \tag{29}$$

on $(\Lambda, \mathcal{A}_\Lambda)$ such that

$$\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}(F) = \mathbb{M}\left(\pi^{-1}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}(F)\right), \quad F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1 \times \cdots \times \mathrm{sp}X_n}, \tag{30}$$

in particular,

$$\frac{1}{n!}\left\{\mathrm{P}_{X_1}(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mathrm{P}_{X_n}(B_n)\right\}_{\mathrm{sym}} = \mathbb{M}(\pi^{-1}_{X_1}(B_1) \cap \cdots \cap \pi^{-1}_{X_n}(B_n)), \tag{31}$$
$$B_i \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_i}, \ i = 1, ..., n,$$

for all collections $\{X_1, ..., X_n\} \subset \mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, of quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$.

Proof. The family $\{\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}\}$ represents a particular example of a general family (B5) if, in the latter, we replace

$$\begin{aligned} &T \to \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \Lambda_t \to \mathrm{sp}X, \quad \widetilde{\Lambda} \to \Lambda \\ &\mathcal{F}_t \to \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X}, \qquad \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{t_1}\times\cdots\times\Lambda_{t_n}} \to \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1\times\cdots\times\mathrm{sp}X_n}. \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Moreover, by lemma 1, the family $\{\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}\}$ satisfies the consistency conditions (B6), (B7). Therefore, representation (30) follows explicitly from relation (B9) in lemma 3 of appendix B. This proves the statement. ■

Theorem 1 allows us to express all real-valued measures

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}(\cdot)], \quad \{X_1,...,X_n\} \subset \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{33}$$

for a quantum state ρ on $\mathcal{H}$ via a single real-valued measure on the algebra $\mathcal{A}_\Lambda$.

Proposition 1 *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex separable Hilbert space and $\{\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}\}$ be family (21) of $\mathcal{L}^{(s)}_{\mathcal{H}}$-valued measures (18). To every state ρ on $\mathcal{H}$, there corresponds ($\rho \overset{\mathfrak{R}}{\mapsto} \mu_\rho$) a unique normalized finitely additive real-valued measure*

$$\mu_\rho : \mathcal{A}_\Lambda \to \mathbb{R}, \quad \mu_\rho(\Lambda) = 1, \tag{34}$$

on $(\Lambda, \mathcal{A}_\Lambda)$ such that

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}(F)] = \mu_\rho\left(\pi^{-1}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}(F)\right), \quad F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1\times\cdots\times\mathrm{sp}X_n}, \tag{35}$$

in particular,

$$\frac{1}{n!}\mathrm{tr}[\rho\{\mathrm{P}_{X_1}(B_1)\cdot\ldots\cdot\mathrm{P}_{X_n}(B_n)\}_{\mathrm{sym}}] = \mu_\rho\left(\pi^{-1}_{X_1}(B_1)\cap\cdots\cap\pi^{-1}_{X_n}(B_n)\right), \tag{36}$$
$$B_i \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_i}, \quad i = 1,...,n,$$

for all collections $\{X_1,...,X_n\} \subset \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, of quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$. If $\rho_j \overset{\mathfrak{R}}{\mapsto} \mu_{\rho_j}$, $j = 1,...,m$, then

$$\sum \alpha_j\rho_j \overset{\mathfrak{R}}{\mapsto} \sum \alpha_j\mu_{\rho_j}, \qquad \alpha_j > 0, \quad \sum \alpha_j = 1. \tag{37}$$

Proof. For a state ρ on $\mathcal{H}$, representation (30) implies

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}(F)] = \mathrm{tr}[\rho\mathbb{M}\left(\pi^{-1}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}(F)\right)] \tag{38}$$

for all sets $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1 \times \cdots \times \mathrm{sp}X_n}$ and all finite collections $\{X_1, ..., X_n\} \subset \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Introduce on the algebra $\mathcal{A}_\Lambda$ the set function

$$\mu_\rho(A) := \mathrm{tr}[\rho \mathbb{M}(A)], \quad A \in \mathcal{A}_\Lambda, \tag{39}$$

defined uniquely $\rho \overset{\mathfrak{R}}{\mapsto} \mu_\rho$ to each state ρ. Since $\mathbb{M}$ is a normalized (finitely additive) measure on the algebra $\mathcal{A}_\Lambda$, also, μ_ρ is a normalized (finitely additive) measure on $\mathcal{A}_\Lambda$. Moreover, since $\mathbb{M}$ is a unique measure on $\mathcal{A}_\Lambda$, satisfying representation (30), the measure μ_ρ, uniquely defined to each state ρ by relation (39), is also a unique normalized real-valued measure on $\mathcal{A}_\Lambda$, satisfying representation (38), hence, (35) and (36).

Further, if $\rho_j \overset{\mathfrak{R}}{\mapsto} \mu_{\rho_j}$, then, due to definition (39) of this mapping, the measure $\sum \alpha_j \mu_{\rho_j}$, where $\alpha_j > 0$ and $\sum \alpha_j = 1$, is a unique real-valued measure, corresponding to the state $\sum \alpha_j \rho_j$ due to (39) and satisfying (35), (36). This completes the proof. ■

For bounded quantum observables, proposition 1 implies the following representation.

Corollary 1 *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex separable Hilbert space. The representation*

$$\frac{1}{n!}\mathrm{tr}[\rho\{X_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot X_n\}_{\mathrm{sym}}] = \int_\Lambda \pi_{X_1}(\lambda) \cdot \ldots \cdot \pi_{X_n}(\lambda)\ \mu_\rho(\mathrm{d}\lambda) \tag{40}$$

holds for all states ρ and all finite collections $\{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}$ of bounded quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$.

Proof. For bounded quantum observables $X_1, ..., X_n$, the operator $\rho\{X_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot X_n\}_{\mathrm{sym}}$ is trace class, so that the quantum average $\mathrm{tr}[\rho\{X_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot X_n\}_{\mathrm{sym}}] < \infty$ exists for all states ρ. Combining (36) and (10), we derive (40). ■

V. QUASI HIDDEN VARIABLE (QHV) MODELLING

As we discussed in section III, the joint von Neumann measurement of quantum observables $X_1, ..., X_n$ on $\mathcal{H}$ is possible if and only if these observables mutually commute and is described in this case by the joint spectral measure $\mathrm{P}_{X_1,...,X_n}$ defined by (15). If a joint von Neumann measurement of mutually commuting quantum observables $X_1, ..., X_n$ is performed on a quantum system in a state ρ on $\mathcal{H}$, then the expression

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho \mathrm{P}_{X_1,...,X_n}(B)], \quad B \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1 \times \cdots \times \mathrm{sp}X_n}, \tag{41}$$

gives the probability that these observables take values $x_1, ...x_n$ such that $(x_1, ...x_n) \in B$. In particular,

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho\{\mathrm{P}_{X_1}(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mathrm{P}_{X_n}(B_n)\}] \tag{42}$$

is the probability that the observed values of $X_1, ..., X_n$ are in sets $B_1 \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1}, ..., B_n \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_n}$, respectively.

For a collection $\{X_1, ..., X_n\}$ of mutually commuting quantum observables, the measure $\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}$ discussed in theorem 1 coincides with the restriction of the joint spectral measure $\mathrm{P}_{X_1,...,X_n}$ to the algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1 \times \cdots \times \mathrm{sp}X_n}$.

In the following sections, this allows us to analyze (theorems 2, 3) a possibility of modelling of the Hilbert space description (42) of all joint von Neumann measurements *in measure theory terms*.

A. A statistically noncontextual qHV model

In this section, we formulate and prove the statements (theorem 2, corollary 2, propositions 2, 3) which immediately give the positive answers to questions 2 and 1, formulated in section II.

For our below consideration, we recall that if quantum observables $X_1, ..., X_n$ mutually commute, then, for each Borel function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, the notation $\psi(X_1, ..., X_n)$ means[26] the quantum observable

$$\psi(X_1, ..., X_n) := \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^n} \psi(x_1, ..., x_n)\ \mathrm{P}_{X_1}(\mathrm{d}x_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mathrm{P}_{X_n}(\mathrm{d}x_n). \tag{43}$$

If a real-valued function ψ is bounded, then the quantum observable $\psi(X_1, ..., X_n)$ is also bounded.

Theorem 2 *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be an arbitrary complex separable Hilbert space. There exist:*

(i) a set Ω and an algebra $\mathcal{F}_\Omega$ of subsets of Ω;

(ii) a one-to-one mapping $\Phi : \mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H} \to \mathfrak{F}_{(\Omega,\mathcal{F}_\Omega)}$ from the set $\mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}$ of all quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$ into the set $\mathfrak{F}_{(\Omega,\mathcal{F}_\Omega)}$ of all random variables on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$, with values $f_X := \Phi(X)$ satisfying the spectral correspondence rule $f_X(\Omega) = \mathrm{sp}X$;

such that, to each quantum state ρ on $\mathcal{H}$, there corresponds $(\rho \overset{\mathfrak{R}}{\mapsto} \nu_\rho)$ a unique normalized

real-valued measure ν_ρ *on* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$, *satisfying the relation*[28]

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho \mathrm{P}_{X_1,...,X_n}(F)] = \nu_\rho \left(f^{-1}_{(X_1,...X_n)}(F) \right), \quad F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1 \times \cdots \times \mathrm{sp}X_n}, \tag{44}$$
$$f_{(X_1,...,X_n)} \ := (f_{X_1}, ..., f_{X_n}),$$

in particular,

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho\{\mathrm{P}_{X_1}(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mathrm{P}_{X_n}(B_n)\}] = \nu_\rho \left(\ f^{-1}_{X_1}(B_1) \cap \cdots \cap f^{-1}_{X_n}(B_n) \right) \tag{45}$$
$$\equiv \int_\Omega \chi_{f^{-1}_{X_1}(B_1)}(\omega) \cdot \ldots \cdot \chi_{f^{-1}_{X_n}(B_n)}(\omega) \nu_\rho(d\omega),$$
$$B_i \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_i}, \quad i = 1, ..., n,$$

for all collections $\{X_1, ..., X_n\}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, *of mutually commuting quantum observables on* $\mathcal{H}$. *In (44),* $P_{X_1,...,X_n}$ *is the joint spectral measure (15). If* $\rho_j \overset{\mathfrak{R}}{\mapsto} \nu_{\rho_j}$, $j = 1, ..., m < \infty$, *then* $\sum \alpha_j \rho_j \overset{\mathfrak{R}}{\mapsto} \sum \alpha_j \nu_{\rho_j}$, *for all* $\alpha_j > 0$, $\sum \alpha_j = 1$.

Proof. In order to prove the existence point of theorem 2, let us take the measurable space $(\Lambda, \mathcal{A}_\Lambda)$ and the random variables $\pi_X(\lambda) = \lambda_X \in \mathrm{sp}X$, $X \in \mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}$, on this space, which are specified in section IV.A. Since $\pi_{X_1} \neq \pi_{X_2} \Leftrightarrow \ X_1 \neq X_2$ and $\pi_X(\Lambda) = \mathrm{sp}X$, the set $\{\pi_X \mid X \in \mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}\}$ of random variables is put into the one-to-one correspondence to the set $\mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}$ of all quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$ and, for each random variable π_X, the spectral correspondence rule $\pi_X(\Lambda) = \mathrm{sp}X$ is fulfilled.

Furthermore, by proposition 1, to each quantum state ρ on $\mathcal{H}$, there corresponds a unique normalized real-valued measures μ_ρ, defined on the algebra $\mathcal{A}_\Lambda$ and satisfying representations (35), (36). For a collection $\{X_1, ..., X_n\}$ of mutually commuting quantum observables, the measure $\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}$ in the left-hand sides of (35), (36) reduces to the joint spectral measure $\mathrm{P}_{X_1,...,X_n}$. Therefore, with random variables $\pi_{X_1}, ..., \pi_{X_n}$ and the measures $\{\mu_\rho, \forall\rho\}$ in the right-hand side, representations (44), (45) hold for all states and all finite collections $\{X_1, ..., X_n\}$ of mutually commuting quantum observables. This proves the existence point of theorem 2. Also, by proposition 1, if $\rho_j \overset{\mathfrak{R}}{\mapsto} \mu_{\rho_j}$, $j = 1, ..., m$, then $\sum \alpha_j \rho_j \overset{\mathfrak{R}}{\mapsto} \sum \alpha_j \mu_{\rho_j}$. This completes the proof. ■

Representations (44), (45) imply.

Corollary 2 *In the setting of theorem 2, for all states* ρ *and all finite collections* $\{X_1, ..., X_n\}$ *of mutually commuting quantum observables, the representation*

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho\psi(X_1, ..., X_n)] = \int_\Omega \psi(f_{X_1}(\omega), ..., f_{X_n}(\omega)) \nu_\rho(\mathrm{d}\omega) \tag{46}$$

holds for all bounded Borel functions $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ *and the representation*

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho(X_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot X_n)] = \int\limits_{\Omega} f_{X_1}(\omega) \cdot \ldots \cdot f_{X_n}(\omega) \nu_\rho\,(\mathrm{d}\omega) \tag{47}$$

is fulfilled whenever mutually commuting quantum observables $X_1, ..., X_n$ *are bounded.*

Proof. For a bounded Borel function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, the quantum observable (43) is bounded, so that the operator $\rho\psi(X_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot X_n)$ is trace class for all states ρ. This and relation (45) imply

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{tr}[\rho\psi(X_1, \ldots, X_n)] &= \int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^n} \psi(x_1, ..., x_n)\ \mathrm{tr}[\rho\{\mathrm{P}_{X_1}(\mathrm{d}x_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mathrm{P}_{X_n}(\mathrm{d}x_n)\}] \\ &= \int\limits_{\Omega} \psi(f_{X_1}(\omega), ..., f_{X_n}(\omega)) \nu_\rho\,(\mathrm{d}\omega)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

The proof of representation (47) is quite similar to our proof of (40). Namely, for bounded quantum observables $X_1, ..., X_n$, the operator $\rho(X_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot X_n)$ is trace class. This and relations (45), (10) imply representation (47). This proves the statement. ■

In view of expressions (41), (42) for the von Neumann joint probabilities, theorem 2 and corollary 2 prove that, for an arbitrary Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, the Hilbert space description of all the joint von Neumann measurements can be reproduced in terms of a single measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ via the set $\{\nu_\rho, \forall\rho\}$ of normalized real-valued measures and the set $\{f_X : \Omega \to \mathrm{sp}X,\ f_X(\Omega) = \mathrm{sp}X,\ X \in \mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}\}$ of random variables – that is, via *a quasi hidden variable (qHV) model*[10,12].

In this qHV model, (i) each quantum observable on $\mathcal{H}$ is modelled on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ by only one random variable representing this quantum observable under all joint von Neumann measurements; (ii) all the von Neumann joint probabilities are reproduced due to the *noncontextual* representations (44), (45) via nonnegative values of real-valued measures and (iii) all the quantum product averages are reproduced due to the *noncontextual representations* (46) (47) via the classical-like averages of the corresponding expressions for the random variables. In view of the setting of theorem 2, in this new model, the Kochen-Specker functional conditions (2) - (4) do not need to hold, however, due to representations (46), (47), all these conditions are satisfied in average – in the sense of relations (6) - (8), discussed in section II.

Therefore, the qHV model specified by theorem 2 and corollary 2 is *statistically noncontextual* according to the terminology outlined in Introduction and section II.

The specific example of such a qHV model is given in the proof of theorem 2.

For the joint von Neumann measurements performed on a quantum state ρ, theorem 2 and corollary 2 imply the following probability model.

Proposition 2 *Let ρ be a state on an arbitrary complex separable Hilbert space. There exist a measure space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega, \nu_\rho)$ with a normalized real-valued measure ν_ρ and a set*

$$\{f_X : \Omega \to \mathrm{sp}X \mid f_X(\Omega) = \mathrm{sp}X, \quad X \in \mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}\} \tag{49}$$

of random variables one-to-one corresponding to the set $\mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}$ of all quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$ such that all the von Neumann joint probabilities (41), (42) admit the noncontextual qHV representation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{tr}[\rho \mathrm{P}_{X_1,...,X_n}(F)] &= \nu_\rho\left(f^{-1}_{(X_1,...X_n)}(F)\right), \quad F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1 \times \cdots \times \mathrm{sp}X_n}, \\ f_{(X_1,...,X_n)} &:= (f_{X_1}, ..., f_{X_n}), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

in particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{tr}[\rho\{\mathrm{P}_{X_1}(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mathrm{P}_{X_n}(B_n)\}] &= \nu_\rho\left(\ f^{-1}_{X_1}(B_1) \cap \cdots \cap f^{-1}_{X_n}(B_n)\right) \\ &\equiv \int_\Omega \chi_{f^{-1}_{X_1}(B_1)}(\omega) \cdot \ldots \cdot \chi_{f^{-1}_{X_n}(B_n)}(\omega) \nu_\rho(d\omega), \\ B_i \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_i}, &\quad i = 1, ..., n \in \mathbb{N}, \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

implying the noncontextual qHV representation

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho(X_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot X_n)] = \int_\Omega f_{X_1}(\omega) \cdot \ldots \cdot f_{X_n}(\omega)\ \nu_\rho\left(\mathrm{d}\omega\right) \tag{52}$$

for the quantum product average whenever mutually commuting quantum observables $X_1, \ldots, X_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, are bounded.

Recall that, in probability theory, a measurement situation (an experiment) is generally described[13] via the Kolmogorov probability model based on the notion of a probability space[2], that is, a measure space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega, \tau)$ where a measure τ is a probability one.

In view of this, proposition 2 points to the generality of the quasi-classical probability (qHV) model introduced in Ref. 12 and incorporating the Kolmogorov probability model as a particular case. This new probability model is also outlined in Introduction.

The noncontextual qHV representation (51) is, in particular, fulfilled for all N-partite joint von Neumann measurements on an N-partite quantum state. This implies the following statement important for quantum information applications.

Proposition 3 *Every N-partite quantum state ρ admits a local qHV (LqHV) model, that is, for each state ρ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_N$, all the N-partite joint von Neumann probabilities*

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho\{\mathrm{P}_{X_1}(B_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathrm{P}_{X_N}(B_N)\}] \tag{53}$$

admit the LqHV representation[10]

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho\{\mathrm{P}_{X_1}(B_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathrm{P}_{X_N}(B_N)\}] = \int\limits_{\Omega} P_{X_1}(B_1;\omega) \cdot \ldots \cdot P_{X_N}(B_N;\omega)\nu_\rho(d\omega) \tag{54}$$

in terms of a single measure space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega, \nu_\rho)$, with a normalized real-valued measure ν_ρ, and conditional probability distributions $P_{X_n}(\cdot\,;\omega)$, $n = 1, ..., N$, each depending only on the corresponding quantum observable X_n on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_n$ at n-th site.

Proof. For a state ρ and quantum observables

$$\begin{aligned} &X_1 \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_2} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_N}, \\ &..., \\ &\mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}_{N-1}} \otimes X_{\mathcal{H}_N}, \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

on $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}_N$, representation (51) has the LqHV form[10]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{tr}[\rho\{\mathrm{P}_{X_1}(B_1) \otimes \ldots \otimes \mathrm{P}_{X_N}(B_N)\}] = \int\limits_{\Omega} \chi_{f_{X_1}^{-1}(B_1)}(\omega) \cdot \ldots \cdot \chi_{f_{X_N}^{-1}(B_N)}(\omega)\nu_\rho(\mathrm{d}\omega), \\ B_1 \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1}, ..., B_N \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_N}. \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

This proves the statement. ■

We stress that, in theorem 2, a mapping Φ does not need to satisfy for each Borel function $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and each quantum observable X the functional conditions (2) - (4) required by Kochen and Specker in Ref. 5. Moreover, in view of the Kochen-Specker result[5], for a mapping Φ in theorem 2, these conditions cannot be fulfilled whenever $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$.

Accordingly, in a statistically noncontextual qHV model specified by theorem 2 and corollary 2, the Kochen-Specker conditions (2) - (4) do not need to hold if $\dim \mathcal{H} = 2$ and

cannot be fulfilled for $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$. *Nevertheless,* for each Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, this new qHV model reproduces all the properties of the von Neumann joint probabilities and product expectations via "noncontextual" random variables. Also, in this new qHV model, all the physically motivated average relations (6) - (8), argued in question 2 of section II, follow explicitly from the noncontextual representations (46), (47).

B. A context-invariant qHV model

It is generally argued that if a mapping Ψ from a set of random variables on $(\Omega,\, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ onto the set of all quantum observable on $\mathcal{H}$ is non-injective, then the corresponding model reproducing in terms of random variables the statistical properties of all quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$ needs to be *contextual* in the sense that, under a joint von Neumann measurement of mutually commuting quantum observables $X_1, ..., X_n$, each observable X_i is modelled by a random variable specific for a context of this joint measurement.

In what follows, we prove (theorem 3) that, for all joint von Neumann measurements, the existence of a statistically noncontextual qHV model, specified by theorem 2 and corollary 2, implies the existence of *a context-invariant qHV model* – a model of a completely new type described, in general, in Introduction and question 3 formulated in section II.

In this new qHV model, the functional condition (5), required in quantum foundations, is fulfilled for each Hilbert space, nevertheless, this model is not contextual.

Consider first the following property proved in appendix C.

Lemma 2 *Let* $\Phi : \mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H} \to \mathfrak{F}_{(\Omega,\mathcal{F}_\Omega)}$, $f_X := \Phi(X)$ *and* $\{\nu_\rho, \forall\rho\}$ *be, correspondingly, the mapping, random variables and the measures specified in theorem 2. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu_\rho(f^{-1}_{\varphi(X)}(B) \cap f^{-1}_{Y_1}(B_1) \cap \cdots \cap f^{-1}_{Y_m}(B_m)) \qquad (57)\\ &= \nu_\rho((\varphi \circ f_X)^{-1}(B) \cap f^{-1}_{Y_1}(B_1) \cap \cdots \cap f^{-1}_{Y_m}(B_m)),\\ &B \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}\varphi(X)}, \quad B_i \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}Y_i}, \quad i = 1, ..., m \in \mathbb{N}, \end{aligned}$$

for all states ρ, *all Borel functions* $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ *and all finite collections* $\{X, Y_1, ..., Y_m\}$ *of mutually commuting quantum observables on* $\mathcal{H}$.

From relations (42), (45) and property (57) it follows that if $f_X,\ f_{\varphi(X)} \in \Phi(\mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H})$ are random variables specified in theorem 2, then the random variables $f_{\varphi(X)}$ and $\varphi \circ f_X$ on

$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ equivalently represent the quantum observable $\varphi(X)$ *under all joint von Neumann measurements* regardless of their measurement contexts. However, for a Borel function $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and a quantum observable X, the random variable $\varphi \circ f_X$ *does not need* to belong to the set $\Phi(\mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H})$ and, moreover, to coincide with the random variable $f_{\varphi(X)}$.

The following theorem (proved in appendix D) answers positively to question 3 put in section II.

Theorem 3 *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be an arbitrary complex separable Hilbert space. There exist:*
(i) a measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$;
(ii) a mapping $\Psi : \mathfrak{F}_{\mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}} \to \mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}$ from a set $\mathfrak{F}_{\mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}}$ of random variables g on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ onto the set $\mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}$ of all quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$, with the spectral correspondence rule $g(\Omega) = \mathrm{sp}X$ for each[29] *$g \in \Psi^{-1}(\{X\})$ and the functional relations*

$$\varphi \circ g \in \mathfrak{F}_{\mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}}, \qquad \Psi(\varphi \circ g) = \varphi \circ \Psi(g) = \varphi \circ X, \qquad \forall g \in \Psi^{-1}(\{X\}), \tag{58}$$

for all Borel functions $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and all quantum observables X;
such that, to each quantum state ρ on $\mathcal{H}$, there corresponds $(\rho \overset{\mathfrak{R}}{\mapsto} \nu_\rho)$ a unique normalized real-valued measure ν_ρ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ satisfying the context-invariant representation

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho\{\mathrm{P}_{X_1}(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mathrm{P}_{X_n}(B_n)\}] = \nu_\rho\left(g_1^{-1}(B_1) \cap \cdots \cap g_n^{-1}(B_n)\right), \qquad \forall g_i \in \Psi^{-1}(\{X_i\}), \tag{59}$$

for all sets $B_i \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_i}$, $i = 1, ..., n$, and all collections $\{X_1, ..., X_n\} \subset \mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, of mutually commuting quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$. If $\rho_j \overset{\mathfrak{R}}{\mapsto} \nu_{\rho_j}$, $j = 1, ..., m < \infty$, then $\sum \alpha_j \rho_j \overset{\mathfrak{R}}{\mapsto} \sum \alpha_j \nu_{\rho_j}$, for all $\alpha_j > 0$, $\sum \alpha_j = 1$.

Theorem 3 implies the following statement proved in appendix D.

Corollary 3 *In the setting of theorem 3, for all states ρ and all finite collections $\{X_1, ..., X_n\} \subset \mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}$ of mutually commuting quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$, the context-invariant representation*

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho\psi(X_1, ..., X_n)] = \int_\Omega \psi(g_1(\omega), ..., g_n(\omega))\nu_\rho(\mathrm{d}\omega), \qquad \forall g_i \in \Psi^{-1}(\{X_i\}), \quad i = 1, ..., n, \tag{60}$$

holds for all bounded Borel functions $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ *and the context-invariant representation*

$$\mathrm{tr}[\rho(X_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot X_n)] = \int\limits_{\Omega} g_1(\omega) \cdot \ldots \cdot g_n(\omega) \nu_\rho \left(\mathrm{d}\omega\right), \qquad (61)$$
$$\forall g_i \in \Psi^{-1}(\{X_i\}), \quad i = 1, ..., n,$$

is fulfilled whenever mutually commuting quantum observables $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ *are bounded.*

Remark 2 *Representations (59) - (61) are context-invariant in the sense that, regardless of a context of a joint von Neumann measurement, into the right-hand sides of these representations, each of random variables* $g_i \in \Psi^{-1}(\{X_i\})$*, modelling on* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ *a quantum observable* X_i*, can be equivalently substituted.*

From theorem 3 and corollary 3 it follows that, for each Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, the Hilbert space description of all the joint von Neumann measurements (equivalently, all the quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$) can be reproduced via a qHV model, where a quantum observable X on $\mathcal{H}$ can be represented on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ by a variety of random variables, but, *due to the context-invariant representations* (59) - (61), each of these random variables *equivalently* models X under all joint von Neumann measurements, regardless of their measurement contexts. In this new qHV model, the functional condition (5) required in quantum foundations is fulfilled for each Hilbert space and constitutes condition (58) in theorem 3. All the relations

Therefore, the qHV model specified by theorem 3 and corollary 3 is *context-invariant* according to the terminology outlined in Introduction and section II.

The specific example of such a qHV model is given in the proof of theorem 3.

In view of relation (58) and the Kochen-Specker result[5], for $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$, a mapping Ψ in theorem 3 cannot be injective. For $\dim \mathcal{H} = 2$, this mapping does not need to be injective due to the setting of theorem 3.

Accordingly, a context-invariant qHV model specified by theorem 3 cannot be noncontextual for $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$ and does not need to be noncontextual if $\dim \mathcal{H} = 2$. *Nevertheless*, in this new model (in contrast to a contextual one), all the von Neumann joint probabilities and product expectations are reproduced via *the context-invariant representations* (59) - (61).

Thus, in contrast to the wide-spread opinion, a model reproducing the statistical properties of all quantum observables via random variables *does not need to be contextual* when-

ever, in this model, a mapping Ψ from a set of random variables onto the set of all quantum observables is non-injective.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In the present paper, we have introduced the two new quasi hidden variable (qHV) models correctly reproducing *in measure theory terms* the Hilbert space description of all joint von Neumann measurements for an arbitrary Hilbert space. These new models answer positively to either of three questions formulated in section II and are important for both – quantum foundations and quantum applications.

For this aim, we had first to generalize (lemma 3) some items of the Kolmogorov extension theorem[2,13] to the case of consistent operator-valued measures. This generalization allowed us to express (theorem 1) all symmetrized finite products of the spectral measures of quantum observables via a unique self-adjoint operator-valued measure and the specific random variables defined on some specially constructed measurable space.

Based on these new mathematical results, we further analyzed modelling of all the von Neumann joint probabilities and product expectations in qHV[10,12] terms. We have proved that, for each Hilbert space, the Hilbert space description of all joint von Neumann measurements can be reproduced via either of the two new quasi hidden variable (qHV) models, *statistically noncontextual and context-invariant.*

In both of these new qHV models, all the von Neumann joint probabilities are represented (theorems 2, 3) via nonnegative values of real-valued measures and all the quantum product expectations – via the qHV average (corollaries 2, 3) of the product of the corresponding random variables.

For $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 4$, the HV versions of these new models cannot exist (see section II).

In a statistically noncontextual qHV model specified by theorem 2 and corollary 2, each quantum observable X on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is represented on a measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ *by only one* random variable f_X, modelling this observable X under all joint von Neumann measurements. In this new model, the Kochen-Specker[5] functional conditions (2) - (4) on a mapping $X \mapsto f_X$ do not need to hold and, moreover, in view of the Kochen-Specker result[5], cannot hold whenever $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$.

Nevertheless, this new qHV model reproduces all the von Neumann joint probabilities

and product expectations via the *noncontextual representations* (44) - (47). Moreover, in this model, the Kochen-Specker functional conditions are satisfied in average – in the sense of relations (6) - (8) discussed in section II.

The specific example of a statistically noncontextual qHV model for all the joint von Neumann measurements is given in the proof of theorem 2.

The proved existence of a statistically noncontextual qHV model, in particular, implies (proposition 3) that *every N-partite quantum state admits a local qHV (LqHV) model* introduced in Ref. 10.

This new result is particularly important for quantum applications since it is specifically the qHV approach that allowed us to construct[10] the quantum analogs of Bell-type inequalities[30] and to find[10] the new exact upper bounds on violation of a Bell-type inequality by a N-partite quantum state – the problem which has been intensively discussed in the literature since the publication[31] of Tsirelson and which is now important for a variety of quantum information processing tasks.

In a context-invariant qHV model specified by theorem 3 and corollary 3, a quantum observable X on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ can be modelled on a measurable space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_\Omega)$ by a variety of random variables satisfying the functional condition (58) (equivalently, (5)) required in quantum foundations, but each of these random variables equivalently represents X under all joint von Neumann measurements, independently of their measurement contexts.

For $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$, a context-invariant qHV model cannot be noncontextual. For $\dim \mathcal{H} = 2$, this qHV model does not need to be noncontextual. *Nevertheless*, in contrast to a contextual HV model, this new qHV model reproduces all the von Neumann joint probabilities and product expectations via *the context-invariant representations* (59) - (61) where, regardless of a context of a joint von Neumann measurement, each of random variables modelling a quantum observable X_i can be equivalently substituted into the right-hand sides.

The specific example of a context-invariant qHV model for all the joint von Neumann measurements is presented in the proof of theorem 3.

The proved existence for each Hilbert space of *a context-invariant qHV model negates the general opinion* that, in terms of random variables satisfying the functional condition (5) required in quantum foundations the Hilbert space description of all the joint von Neumann measurements (equivalently, all the quantum observables) for $\dim \mathcal{H} \geq 3$ can be reproduced only contextually.

We stress that it is specifically the real-valued measures and the random variables introduced in proposition 1 that allowed us to prove the existence for all the joint von Neumann measurements of the noncontextual representations (44) - (47) and the context-invariant representations (59) - (61). Accordingly, the appearance of these real-valued measures in a model is due to our accounting of the structure of projection-valued measures describing joint von Neumann measurements.

The results of the present paper also underline the generality of the quasi-classical probability model proposed in Ref. 12.

Acknowledgement 1 *I am very grateful to Professor V. N. Samarov for his helpful and encouraging comments. The discussions with Professor M. E. Shirokov are much appreciated.*

Appendix A: proof of lemma 1

Relation (22) follows explicitly from the symmetrized form of the right-hand side in (19). In order to prove (23), let us first take a collection $\{X_1, ..., X_n\}$ of bounded quantum observables with discrete spectrums. In this case, the measure $\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}$ is given by representation (20) and taking into the account that $\mathrm{P}_{X_i}(\mathrm{sp}X_i) = \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}\left(\{(x_1, ..., x_n) \in \mathrm{sp}X_1 \times \cdots \times \mathrm{sp}X_n \mid (x_{i_1}, ..., x_{i_k}) \in F\}\right) \qquad \text{(A1)}\\
&= \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{(x_{i_1},...,x_{i_k})\in F} \left\{ \mathrm{P}_{X_1}(\{x_1\}) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mathrm{P}_{X_n}(\{x_n\})\right\}_{\mathrm{sym}}\\
&= \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{(x_{i_1},...,x_{i_k})\in F} \left\{\mathrm{P}_{X_{i_1}}(\{x_{i_1}\}) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mathrm{P}_{X_{i_k}}(\{x_{i_k}\})\right\}_{\mathrm{sym}}\\
&= \mathcal{P}_{(X_{i_1},...,X_{i_k})}(F).
\end{aligned}$$

For an arbitrary collection $\{X_1, ..., X_n\} \subset \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$ of quantum observables on $\mathcal{H}$, let $\mathcal{E}$ be the set of all rectangles $E := B_{i_1} \times \cdots \times B_{i_k}$ with measurable sides $B_i \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_i}$. Since the product algebra $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sp}X_{i_1}\times\cdots\times\mathrm{sp}X_{i_k}}$ consists of all finite unions of mutually disjoint rectangles from $\mathcal{E}$, every set $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{sp}X_{i_1}\times\cdots\times\mathrm{sp}X_{i_k}}$ admits a finite decomposition

$$F = \bigcup_{m=1,...,M} E_m, \quad E_{m_1} \cap E_{m_2} = \varnothing, \quad E_m \in \mathcal{E}, \quad M < \infty. \qquad \text{(A2)}$$

Taking into the account that $\mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{(X_{i_1},...,X_{i_k})}$ are finitely additive measures and also, relations (A2), (19) and $\mathrm{P}_{X_i}(\mathrm{sp}X_i) = \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}\left(\{(x_1,...,x_n) \in \mathrm{sp}X_1 \times \cdots \times \mathrm{sp}X_n \mid (x_{i_1},...,x_{i_k}) \in F\}\right) \qquad \text{(A3)} \\ = & \sum_{m=1,...,M} \mathcal{P}_{(X_1,...,X_n)}\left(\{(x_1,...,x_n) \in \mathrm{sp}X_1 \times \cdots \times \mathrm{sp}X_n \mid (x_{i_1},...,x_{i_k}) \in E_m\}\right) \\ = & \sum_{m=1,...,M} \mathcal{P}_{(X_{i_1},...,X_{i_k})}\left(E_m\right) \\ = & \mathcal{P}_{(X_{i_1},...,X_{i_k})}\left(F\right). \end{aligned}$$

This proves lemma 1.

Appendix B: a generalization of the Kolmogorov extension theorem

In this appendix, we generalize (lemma 3) to the case of consistent operator-valued measures some items of the Kolmogorov consistency theorem[2,13] for a family of consistent probability measures (24).

For an uncountable index set T, consider a family $\{(\Lambda_t, \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_t}), t \in T\}$ of measurable spaces, where each Λ_t is a non-empty set and $\mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_t}$ is an algebra of subsets of Λ_t.

Let $\mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{t_1}\times\cdots\times\Lambda_{t_n}}$ be the product algebra on $\Lambda_{t_1} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_n}$, that is, the algebra generated by all rectangles $F_1 \times \cdots \times F_n \subseteq \Lambda_{t_1} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_n}$ with measurable sides $F_k \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{t_k}}$.

Denote by $\widetilde{\Lambda} := \prod_{t\in T} \Lambda_t$ the Cartesian product[25] of all sets Λ_t, $t \in T$, that is, $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ is the collection of all functions $\lambda : T \to \cup_{t\in T}\Lambda_t$ with values $\lambda(t) := \lambda_t \in \Lambda_t$.

The set of all cylindrical subsets of $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ of the form

$$\mathcal{J}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}(F) := \{\lambda \in \widetilde{\Lambda} \mid (\lambda_{t_1},...,\lambda_{t_n}) \in F\}, \qquad F \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{t_1}\times\cdots\times\Lambda_{t_n}}, \qquad \text{(B1)}$$

where $\{t_1,...,t_n\} \subset T$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, constitutes[13,25] an algebra on $\widetilde{\Lambda}$ that we further denote by $\mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}$. Since $\mathcal{J}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}(F) \equiv \pi^{-1}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}(F)$, where the function

$$\pi_{(t_1,...,t_n)} : \widetilde{\Lambda} \to \Lambda_{t_1} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_n} \qquad \text{(B2)}$$

is the canonical projection

$$\pi_{(t_1,...,t_n)}(\lambda) := (\pi_{t_1}(\lambda),...,\pi_{t_n}(\lambda)), \qquad \pi_t(\lambda) := \lambda_t, \qquad \text{(B3)}$$

we have

$$\mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}} = \{\pi^{-1}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}(F) \subseteq \widetilde{\Lambda} \ \mid \ F \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{t_1}\times\cdots\times\Lambda_{t_n}}, \ \ \{t_1,...,t_n\} \subset T, \ \ n \in \mathbb{N}\}. \qquad \text{(B4)}$$

Introduce a family

$$\{\mathfrak{M}_{(t_1,...,t_n)} : \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{t_1}\times\cdots\times\Lambda_{t_n}} \to \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}^{(s)} \mid \mathfrak{M}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}(\Lambda_{t_1}\times\cdots\times\Lambda_{t_n}) = \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad \{t_1,...,t_n\} \subset T, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}\} \tag{B5}$$

of normalized finitely additive $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}^{(s)}$-valued measures $\mathfrak{M}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}$, each specified by a finite collection $\{t_1,...,t_n\} \subset T$ of indices and having values that are self-adjoint bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{H}$.

Let, for each finite index collection $\{t_1,...,t_n\} \subset T$, these measures satisfy the consistency condition

$$\mathfrak{M}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}(F_1\times\cdots\times F_n) = \mathfrak{M}_{(t_{i_1},...,t_{i_n})}(F_{i_1}\times\cdots\times F_{i_n}), \tag{B6}$$
$$F_i \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{t_i}}, \quad i = 1,...,n,$$

for all permutations $\binom{1,...,n}{i_1,...,i_n}$ of indexes and the consistency condition

$$\mathfrak{M}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}\left(\{(\lambda_1,...,\lambda_n) \in \Lambda_{t_1}\times\cdots\times\Lambda_{t_n} \mid (\lambda_{i_1},...,\lambda_{i_k}) \in F\}\right) \tag{B7}$$
$$= \mathfrak{M}_{(t_{i_1},...,t_{i_k})}(F), \qquad F \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{t_{i_1}}\times\cdots\times\Lambda_{t_{i_k}}},$$

for each $\{t_{i_1},...,t_{i_k}\} \subseteq \{t_1,...,t_n\}$.

Lemma 3 *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a complex separable Hilbert space. For a family (B5) of normalized finitely additive $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}^{(s)}$-valued measures $\mathfrak{M}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}$ satisfying the consistency conditions (B6) and (B7), there exists a unique normalized finitely additive $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}^{(s)}$-valued measure*

$$\mathbb{M} : \mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}} \to \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}^{(s)}, \qquad \mathbb{M}(\widetilde{\Lambda}) = \mathbb{I}_{\mathcal{H}}, \tag{B8}$$

on $(\widetilde{\Lambda}, \mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}})$ such that

$$\mathbb{M}\left(\pi^{-1}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}(F)\right) = \mathfrak{M}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}(F) \tag{B9}$$

for all sets $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{t_1}\times\cdots\times\Lambda_{t_n}}$ and an arbitrary index collection $\{t_1,...,t_n\} \subset T$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Our proof of lemma 3 is quite similar to the proof[2,13] of the corresponding items in the Kolmogorov extension theorem for consistent probability measures (24). Let $\mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}$ be algebra (B4) on $\widetilde{\Lambda}$. Suppose that a set $A \in \mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}$ admits representation $A = \pi^{-1}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}(F)$, where $\{t_1,...,t_n\} \subset T$ and $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{t_1}\times\cdots\times\Lambda_{t_n}}$, and take

$$\mathbb{M}(A) := \mathfrak{M}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}(F). \tag{B10}$$

In order to show that relation (B10) defines correctly a set function $\mathbb{M}$ on $\mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}$, we must prove that this relation implies a unique value of $\mathbb{M}$ on a set A even if this set A admits two different representations, say:

$$A = \pi^{-1}_{(t_{i_1},...,t_{i_k})}(F) \equiv \{\lambda \in \widetilde{\Lambda} \mid (\lambda_{t_{i_1}}, ..., \lambda_{t_{i_k}}) \in F\}, \tag{B11}$$
$$A = \pi^{-1}_{(t_{j_1},...,t_{j_m})}(F') \equiv \{\lambda \in \widetilde{\Lambda} \mid (\lambda_{t_{j_1}}, ..., \lambda_{t_{j_m}}) \in F'\}$$

for some sets $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{t_{i_1}} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_{i_k}}}$ and $F' \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{t_{j_1}} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_{j_m}}}$ and some index collections $\{t_{i_1}, ..., t_{i_k}\}$, $\{t_{j_1}, ..., t_{j_m}\} \subset T$.

Denote

$$\{t_{i_1}, ..., t_{i_k}\} \cup \{t_{j_1}, ..., t_{j_m}\} = \{t_1, ..., t_n\}. \tag{B12}$$

From representations (B11) it follows that sets F and F' are such that, for a point $(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n)$ in the set $\Lambda_{t_1} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_n}$, the condition $(\lambda_{i_1}, ..., \lambda_{i_k}) \in F$ and the condition $(\lambda_{j_1}, ..., \lambda_{j_m}) \in F'$ are equivalent, that is:

$$\{\ (\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \Lambda_{t_1} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_n} \mid (\lambda_{i_1}, ..., \lambda_{i_k}) \in F\} \tag{B13}$$
$$= \{\ (\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \Lambda_{t_1} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_n} \mid (\lambda_{j_1}, ..., \lambda_{j_m}) \in F'\}\,.$$

Due to relations (B10) - (B13) and the consistency conditions (B6) and (B7), we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{M}(\pi^{-1}_{(t_{i_1},...,t_{i_k})}(F)) &= \mathfrak{M}_{(t_{i_1},...,t_{i_k})}(F) \qquad\qquad (B14)\\
&= \mathfrak{M}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}\left(\{(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \Lambda_{t_1} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_n} \mid (\lambda_{i_1}, ..., \lambda_{i_k}) \in F\}\right)\\
&= \mathfrak{M}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}\left(\{(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \Lambda_{t_1} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_n} \mid (\lambda_{j_1}, ..., \lambda_{j_m}) \in F'\}\right)\\
&= \mathfrak{M}_{(t_{j_1},...,t_{jm})}(F')\\
&= \mathbb{M}(\pi^{-1}_{(t_{j_1},...,t_{j_m})}(F')).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, relation (B10) defines a unique set function $\mathbb{M} : \mathcal{A}_\Lambda \to \mathcal{L}_\mathcal{H}$ satisfying condition (B9). Since $\widetilde{\Lambda} = \pi^{-1}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}(\Lambda_{t_1} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_n})$ and $\mathfrak{M}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}(\Lambda_{t_1} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_n}) = \mathbb{I}_\mathcal{H}$, from (B10) it follows that this set function $\mathbb{M}$ is normalized, that is, $\mathbb{M}(\widetilde{\Lambda}) = \mathbb{I}_\mathcal{H}$.

In order to prove that the normalized set function $\mathbb{M} : \mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}} \to \mathcal{L}_\mathcal{H}$ is additive, let us consider in the algebra $\mathcal{A}_\Lambda$ two disjoint sets

$$A_1 = \pi^{-1}_{(t_{i_1},...,t_{i_k})}(F_1), \quad A_2 = \pi^{-1}_{(t_{j_1},...,t_{j_m})}(F_2), \quad A_1 \cap A_2 = \varnothing, \tag{B15}$$

specified by some index collections $\{t_{i_1}, ..., t_{i_k}\}$, $\{t_{j_1}, ..., t_{j_m}\} \subseteq \{t_1, ..., t_n\} \subset T$ and sets $F_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{t_{i_1}} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_{i_k}}}$ and $F_2 \in \mathcal{F}_{\Lambda_{t_{j_1}} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_{j_m}}}$. Since $A_1 \cap A_2 = \varnothing$, the sets F_1, F_2 in (B15)

are such that, for a point $(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n)$ in $\Lambda_{t_1} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_n}$, conditions $(\lambda_{i_1}, ..., \lambda_{i_k}) \in F_1$ and $(\lambda_{j_1}, ..., \lambda_{j_m}) \in F_2$ are mutually exclusive, that is:

$$\begin{aligned} &\{(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \Lambda_{t_1} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_n} \mid (\lambda_{i_1}, ..., \lambda_{i_k}) \in F_1\} \\ &\cap \{(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \Lambda_{t_1} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_n} \mid (\lambda_{j_1}, ..., \lambda_{j_m}) \in F_2\} \\ &= \varnothing. \end{aligned} \tag{B16}$$

Taking into the account relations (B10), (B15), (B16), the consistency conditions (B6), (B7) and also that each $\mathfrak{M}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}$ is a finitely additive measure, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{M}(A_1 \cup A_2) \\ &= \mathfrak{M}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}(\{(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \Lambda_{t_1} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_n} \mid (\lambda_{i_1}, ..., \lambda_{i_k}) \in F_1 \ \text{ or } \ (\lambda_{j_1}, ..., \lambda_{j_m}) \in F_2\}) \\ &= \mathfrak{M}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}\left(\{(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \Lambda_{t_1} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_n} \mid (\lambda_{i_1}, ..., \lambda_{i_k}) \in F_1\}\right) \\ &\quad + \mathfrak{M}_{(t_1,...,t_n)}\left(\{(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n) \in \Lambda_{t_1} \times \cdots \times \Lambda_{t_n} \mid (\lambda_{j_1}, ..., \lambda_{j_m}) \in F_2\}\right) \\ &= \mathfrak{M}_{(t_{i_1},...,t_{i_k})}(F_1) + \mathfrak{M}_{(t_{j_1},...,t_{j_m})}(F_2) \\ &= \mathbb{M}(A_1) + \mathbb{M}(A_2). \end{aligned} \tag{B17}$$

Therefore, the normalized set function $\mathbb{M}$ on $\mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}$ defined via relation (B10) is additive and constitutes a finitely additive measure on $\mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}}$, see remark 1.

Thus, the set function $\mathbb{M} : \mathcal{A}_{\widetilde{\Lambda}} \to \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}^{(s)}$ defined by relation (B10) constitutes a unique normalized finitely additive $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}^{(s)}$-valued measure satisfying representation (B9). This completes the proof of lemma 3. ■

Appendix C: proof of lemma 2

For a quantum observable $X \in \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$, bounded or unbounded, and a Borel function $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, the quantum observable $\varphi(X) \equiv \varphi \circ X$ is defined as[23]

$$\varphi(X) := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi(x) \mathrm{P}_X(\mathrm{d}x) \tag{C1}$$

and has the spectrum $\mathrm{sp}\varphi(X) = \varphi(\mathrm{sp}X)$. Its spectral measure $\mathrm{P}_{\varphi(X)}$ satisfies the relation

$$\mathrm{P}_{\varphi(X)}(B) = \mathrm{P}_X(\varphi^{-1}(B)), \quad B \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}\varphi(X)}. \tag{C2}$$

Due to (C2), if quantum observables $X, Y_1, ..., Y_m$ mutually commute, then the same is true for quantum observables $\varphi(X), Y_1, ..., Y_m$.

For arbitrary mutually commuting observables $X, Y_1, ..., Y_m$ on $\mathcal{H}$, relation (45) and property (C2) imply

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu_\rho(f^{-1}_{\varphi(X)}(B) \cap f^{-1}_{Y_1}(B_1) \cap \cdots \cap f^{-1}_{Y_m}(B_m)) \qquad \text{(C3)} \\ &= \mathrm{tr}[\rho\{\mathrm{P}_{\varphi(X)}(B) \cdot \mathrm{P}_{Y_1}(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mathrm{P}_{Y_m}(B_m)\}] \\ &= \mathrm{tr}[\rho\left\{\mathrm{P}_X(\varphi^{-1}(B)) \cdot \mathrm{P}_{Y_1}(B_1) \cdot \ldots \cdot \mathrm{P}_{Y_m}(B_m)\right\}] \\ &= \nu_\rho(f^{-1}_X(\varphi^{-1}(B)) \cap f^{-1}_{Y_1}(B_1) \cap \cdots \cap f^{-1}_{Y_m}(B_m)) \\ &= \nu_\rho((\varphi \circ f_X)^{-1}(B) \cap f^{-1}_{Y_1}(B_1) \cap \cdots \cap f^{-1}_{Y_m}(B_m)). \end{aligned}$$

This proves lemma 2.

Appendix D: proof of theorem 3 and corollary 3

In order to prove the existence point of theorem 3, let us take the specific statistically noncontextual qHV model that we used for the proof of theorem 2. Namely, let $(\Lambda, \mathcal{F}_\Lambda)$ and $\pi_X : \Lambda \to \mathrm{sp}X$, $X \in \mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}$, be the measurable space and the random variables specified in theorem 1. Then the one-to-one mapping $\widetilde{\Phi} : \mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H} \to \mathfrak{F}_{(\Lambda,\mathcal{F}_\Lambda)}$, defined by $\widetilde{\Phi}(X) = \pi_X$, $\forall X \in \mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}$, satisfies the setting of theorem 2.

Note that, for each Borel function $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and each observable X, the random variable $\varphi \circ \pi_X : \Lambda \to \mathrm{sp}\varphi(X)$ satisfies the spectral correspondence rule $(\varphi \circ \pi_X)(\Lambda) = \mathrm{sp}\varphi(X)$ but does not coincide with the random variable $\pi_{\varphi(X)}$ and does not belong to the image $\widetilde{\Phi}(\mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H})$. However, due to representation (45) and property (57), the random variables $\varphi \circ \pi_X$ and $\pi_{\varphi(X)}$ equivalently model the quantum observable $\varphi(X)$ under all joint von Neumann measurements, *independently* of their measurements contexts.

Taking all this into the account, let $\phi^{(\theta)}_X(Y_\theta) = X$, with a Borel function $\phi^{(\theta)}_X : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, an observable $Y_\theta \in \mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}$ and $\theta \in \Theta_X$, be a possible functional representation of a quantum observable $X \in \mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}$ via a quantum observable Y_θ. Here, Θ_X is an index set of all such representations of an observable X. Since there is always the trivial representation where $Y_{\theta_0} \equiv X$, $\phi^{(\theta_0)}_X(X) \equiv X$, the set Θ_X is non-empty for each X.

Denote by $[\pi_X]$ the set of the following random variables on $(\Lambda, \mathcal{F}_\Lambda)$:

$$\begin{aligned} &[\pi_X] = \{g^{(\theta)}_X \mid \theta \in \Theta_X\}, \quad \text{where } \; g^{(\theta_0)}_X = \pi_X, \quad g^{(\theta)}_X = \phi^{(\theta)}_X \circ \pi_{Y_\theta}, \qquad \text{(D1)} \\ &\phi^{(\theta)}_X \circ Y_\theta = X, \quad \phi^{(\theta)}_X : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}, \quad Y_\theta \in \mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}. \end{aligned}$$

By lemma 2, all random variables in $[\pi_X]$ equivalently represent an observable X under all joint von Neumann measurements. Moreover, by our construction of the set $[\pi_X]$, each random variable $g_X^{(\theta)} \in [\pi_X]$ satisfies the spectral correspondence rule $g_X^{(\theta)}(\Lambda) = \mathrm{sp}X$.

In order to prove that

$$X_1 \neq X_2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad [\pi_{X_1}] \cap [\pi_{X_2}] = \varnothing, \tag{D2}$$

let us suppose that, for some observables $X_1 \neq X_2$, the intersection $[\pi_{X_1}] \cap [\pi_{X_2}] \neq \varnothing$. Then $\mathrm{sp}X_1 = \mathrm{sp}X_2$ and a common random variable $g \in [\pi_{X_1}] \cap [\pi_{X_2}]$ admits either of representations

$$\begin{gathered} g = \phi_{X_1} \circ \pi_{Y_1}, \quad g = \phi_{X_2} \circ \pi_{Y_2}, \quad \text{where} \\ \phi_{X_1}(Y_1) = X_1, \quad \phi_{X_2}(Y_2) = X_2, \quad Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}, \end{gathered} \tag{D3}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{Y_1}^{-1}(\phi_{X_1}^{-1}(B)) &= (\phi_{X_1} \circ \pi_{Y_1})^{-1}(B) \\ &= (\phi_{X_2} \circ \pi_{Y_2})^{-1}(B) = \pi_{Y_2}^{-1}(\phi_{X_2}^{-1}(B)) \end{aligned} \tag{D4}$$

for each $B \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1} = \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_2}$. Due to (C2), (31) and (D4), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{P}_{X_1}(B) &= \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{X_1}(Y_1)}(B) = \mathrm{P}_{Y_1}(\phi_{X_1}^{-1}(B)) \\ &= \mathbb{M}(\pi_{Y_1}^{-1}(\phi_{X_1}^{-1}(B)) \\ &= \mathbb{M}((\pi_{Y_2}^{-1}(\phi_{X_2}^{-1}(B))) \\ &= \mathrm{P}_{Y_2}(\phi_{X_2}^{-1}(B)) = \mathrm{P}_{\phi_{X_2}(Y_2)}(B) = \mathrm{P}_{X_2}(B), \\ B &\in \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_1} = \mathcal{B}_{\mathrm{sp}X_2}. \end{aligned} \tag{D5}$$

In view of the spectral theorem (10), relation $\mathrm{P}_{X_1}(B) = \mathrm{P}_{X_2}(B)$, $\forall B$, implies $X_1 = X_2$. Thus, if $[\pi_{X_1}] \cap [\pi_{X_2}] \neq \varnothing$, then $X_1 = X_2$. This proves (D2).

Let

$$\mathfrak{F}_{\mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}} := \bigcup_{X \in \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}} [\pi_X] \tag{D6}$$

be the union of all disjoint sets $[\pi_X]$, $\forall X \in \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$, of random variables and $\Psi : \mathfrak{F}_{\mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}} \to \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}$ be the mapping defined via the relation

$$\Psi(g) = X, \quad g \in [\pi_X] \subset \mathfrak{F}_{\mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}}, \quad X \in \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}, \tag{D7}$$

and having, therefore, the preimage

$$\Psi^{-1}(\{X\}) = [\pi_X], \quad X \in \mathfrak{X}_{\mathcal{H}}. \tag{D8}$$

For a Borel function $\varphi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and an arbitrary $g_X^{(\theta)} \in [\pi_X] = \Psi^{-1}(\{X\})$, consider the random variable $\varphi \circ g_X^{(\theta)}$. Due to our above construction (D1) of the set $[\pi_X]$, a random variable $g_X^{(\theta)}$ admits a representation

$$g_X^{(\theta)} = \phi_X^{(\theta)} \circ \pi_{Y_\theta}, \tag{D9}$$

where a Borel function $\phi_X^{(\theta)} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and a quantum observable Y_θ are such that $\phi_X^{(\theta)} \circ Y_\theta = X$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi \circ g_X^{(\theta)} &= (\varphi \circ \phi_X^{(\theta)}) \circ \pi_{Y_\theta} \\ &\in [\pi_{(\varphi \circ \phi_X^{(\theta)}) \circ Y_\theta}] = [\pi_{\varphi \circ X}] = \Psi^{-1}(\{\varphi \circ X\}). \end{aligned} \tag{D10}$$

Thus, the mapping Ψ, defined by relation (D7), satisfies the functional condition (58).

Combining all this with representation (45), property (57), definitions (D1), (D7) we prove the existence point of theorem 3, in particular, the context-independence of representation (59).

The relation $\sum \alpha_j \rho_j \overset{\mathfrak{R}}{\mapsto} \sum \alpha_j \nu_{\rho_j}$ in theorem 3 follows explicitly from relation (37) in proposition 1. This completes the proof of theorem 3.

In corollary 3, the context-independent representations (60), (61) follow from (59), (43), (10) and are proved quite similarly to our proof of (46), (47).

REFERENCES

[1] J. von Neumann, *Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1932).

J. von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1955) (Eng. transl.).

[2] A. N. Kolmogorov, *Grundbegriffe der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1933).

[3] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).

[4] In this pair, Ω is a set and $\mathcal{F}_\Omega$ is an algebra of subsets of Ω.

[5]S. Kochen and E. Specker, J. Math. Mech. **17**, No. 1, 59 (1967).

[6]A. S. Holevo, *Statistical Structure of Quantum Theory* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2001).

[7]E. R. Loubenets, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **41**, 445303 (2008).

[8]J. S. Bell, Physics **1**, 195 (1964).

[9]J. S. Bell, Rev. Mod. Phys. **38,** N 3, 447 (1966).

[10]E. R. Loubenets, J. Math. Phys. **53**, 022201 (2012).

[11]A correlation scenario admits a general LqHV model iff it admits a deterministic LqHV model, see Ref. 12 for details.

[12]E. R. Loubenets, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **45**, 185306 (2012).

[13]A. N. Shiryaev, *Probability* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1996).

[14]For this statement, see, for example, theorem 6 in Ref. 15.

[15]M. A. Neimark, *Operatorenalgebra in Hilbertschnen Raum in Sowjetische Arbeiten Funktional analysis* (Verlag Kultur und Fortschritt, Berlin, 1954).

[16]This follows from the representation $\langle X\rangle_\rho = \langle f_X^{(\theta)}\rangle_{HV}$, condition (5) and the property of mutually commuting quantum observables referred to in Ref. 14.

[17]For the concepts of Bell's locality, the EPR locality and nonsignaling, see section 3 in Ref. 7.

[18]R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).

[19]M. Terhal, A. C. Doherty, and D. Schwab, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 157903 (2003).

[20]E. R. Loubenets, Banach Center Publ. **73**, 325; e-print arXiv:quant-ph/0406139.

[21]E. R. Loubenets, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **38**, L653 (2005).

[22]E. R. Loubenets, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **39,** 5115 (2006).

[23]M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics* (New York: Academic Press, 1972).

[24]E. B. Davies, *Quantum Theory of Open Systems* (London: Academic Press, 1976).

[25]N. Dunford and J. T. Schwartz (1957), *Linear Operators. Part I: General theory* (New York: Interscience).

[26]M. Sh. Birman and M. Z. Solomyak, *Spectral theory of self-adjoint operators in Hilbert spaces* (Dordrecht: Reidel, 1987).

[27]J. Diestel and J. J. Uhl, *Vector Measures* (Mathematical Surveys, no. 15, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1977).

[28]In theorem 2, the set $f^{-1}(F) := \{\omega \in \Omega \mid f(\omega) \in F \} \in \mathcal{F}_\Omega$ is the preimage of a set F under the mapping f and $\chi_B(\cdot)$ is the indicator function of a set B, that is, $\chi_B(\omega) = 1$ for $\omega \in B$ and $\chi_B(\omega) = 0$ for $\omega \notin B$.

[29]The notation $\Psi^{-1}(\{X\}) := \{g \in \mathfrak{F}_{\mathfrak{X}_\mathcal{H}} \mid \Psi(g) = X\}$ means the preimage of an observable X under the mapping Ψ.

[30]E. R. Loubenets, J. Phys. A: Math. Theor. **41**, 445304 (2008).

[31]B. S. Tsirelson, Lett. Math. Phys. **4**, 93 (1980).